

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-6, 9-28, 32-41 and 45-55 are pending in this application.

Claims 1, 23 and 32 have been amended and claims 56-57 have been added by the present Amendment. Amended claims 1, 23 and 32, and new claims 56-57 do not introduce any new subject matter.

**APRIL 14, 2009 INTERVIEW**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his cooperation during the interview of April 14, 2009, and submits the following arguments in view of same.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of (1) claims 1-15, 18-25, 28, 32-41 and 45-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0003571 ("Schofield") in view of WO 02/073964 ("Wong"); and (2) claims 16-17, 26-27 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schofield in view of Wong.

Claims 1 and 23 recite, *inter alia*, at least one strap that passes through a groove formed by a front wall and a back wall of the video display device, wherein top and bottom sides of the video display device connect the front and back walls to each other, and the top and bottom sides include respective holes therein for receiving the at least one strap therethrough.

Claim 32 recites, *inter alia*, that the membrane includes a flap that is opened to provide an opening through which the video display device is placed in the structure, and wherein the flap wraps around part of the body portion to close the opening, wherein the flap is removably fastened to a back wall of the body portion to allow a user

to open and close the flap.

Applicant respectfully submits that Schofield, when taken alone, or in combination with Wong does not disclose or suggest the strap configuration or the membrane as claimed.

**Claims 1 and 23**

The cited references do not disclose or suggest the claimed strap that passes through a groove formed by the front and back walls of the display device.

For example, referring to Fig. 3C of Applicant's disclosure, a strap 15 passes through a groove 17 formed by front and back walls 11 and 12.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, in Wong, the attachment clips 74 and the back wall 72 form the opening through which the strap 60 passes. Accordingly, in Wong, the straps 60 pass under clips 74 attached to the outside of the back wall 72, and, unlike the claimed embodiments, there is no groove for the strap formed by the front and back walls of the display device.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 23 are patentable over Schofield, when taken alone, or in combination with Wong.

In addition, for at least the reason that claims 2-6 and 9-22 depend from claim 1, and claims 24-28 depend from claim 23, claims 2-6, 9-22 and 24-28 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

**Claim 32**

The cited references do not disclose or suggest the claimed membrane that includes a flap that is opened to provide an opening through which the video display

device is placed in the structure, and wherein the flap wraps around part of the body portion to close the opening, wherein the flap is removably fastened to a back wall of the body portion to allow a user to open and close the flap.

For example, Applicant's disclosure states that the membrane 125 includes a flap 126 which wraps around a top portion of the body portion 105 and adheres to a back side 112 of the body portion 105 to close the opening. The flap adheres to the back side 112 with a fastening means capable of being opened and closed. See, e.g., Applicant's disclosure, ¶ 0043, and Figs. 5B-5E.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, what the Examiner refers to as membranes in Schofield (elements 6730 and 6738 in Fig. 67) do not include the claimed flap that wraps around part of the body portion to close the opening, wherein the flap is removably fastened to a back wall of the body portion to allow a user to open and close the flap. Furthermore, the cited portion of Wong (page 7, lines 12-15) does not cure this deficiency in Schofield.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 32 is patentable over Schofield, when taken alone, or in combination with Wong.

In addition, for at least the reason that claims 33-41 and 45-55 depend from claim 32, claims 33-41 and 45-55 are also submitted to be patentable over the cited references.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1-6, 9-28 and 32-55 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

**DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

Applicant has not independently addressed the rejections of all the dependent claims because Applicant submits that, in view of the amendments to the claims presented herein and, for at least similar reasons as why the independent claims from which the dependent claims depend are believed allowable as discussed, *supra*, the dependent claims are also allowable. Applicant however, reserves the right to address any individual rejections of the dependent claims should such be necessary or appropriate.

**NEW CLAIMS**

Applicant respectfully submits new claims 56 and 57 for the Examiner's consideration.

An early and favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner has any further questions or comments, the Examiner may telephone Applicant's Attorney to reach a prompt disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Michael F. Morano  
Reg. No. 44,952  
Attorney for Applicant

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, NY 11797  
(516) 692-8888